

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections and objections.

Claim Objections:

Claims 8-9, 10, 16, 20-22, 24, 27, and 28-37 have been objected to because of alleged informalities that are recited on pages 2 and 3 of the Official Action. In response thereto, the claims have been carefully reviewed and amended where appropriate to address the issues raised by the Examiner. Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments overcome the objections to the claims. However, in the event that there are any issues concerning those matters, the Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that such issues may be promptly resolved.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1, 5-19, 21-24, 27 and 34-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by EP1 004 269 A1, hereinafter *Carrozzi*. And, claims 2-4, 20, 25-26, and 28-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carrozzi*.

In response to the rejection, claim 1 has been amended to include, among other elements, the subject matter of claim 5. The claim has also been amended to clarify that the magnetic structure base block supports the magnetic resonance apparatus magnet structure, and the patient table is supported by a supporting structure. The claim now defines that the base block of the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus has wheels, rollers, or other means for sliding or rotating the

magnetic resonance imaging apparatus relative to the patient table. That feature is not taught or suggested by *Carrozzi*. Specifically, see paragraph [0048] of the published application, wherein it states that the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus may be rotated.

In contrast to amended claim 1, in *Carrozzi*, only the patient table can be rotated about the guide 5. There is no teaching or suggestion that the magnetic resonance apparatus or the magnetic structure thereof is supported by a base block that can be rotated by wheels, rollers, or other means. By providing the base block of the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus with wheels, rollers, or other means for sliding or rotating, the system according to claim 1 is more versatile than that disclosed by *Carrozzi*. Accordingly, claim 1 is now patentable over *Carrozzi*. Claims 2-4 and 6-27 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1, and are thus also patentable over *Carrozzi*. The dependent claims recite additional features, which may also provide additional reasons for patentability of the dependent claims.

Claim 28 states that the system comprises at least two separate guide sections. See, e.g., Fig. 11 and paragraph [0044]. *Carrozzi* does not teach or suggest this combination. Accordingly, claim 28 is also patentable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 34 defines a system comprising a magnetic resonance imaging apparatus and at least one patient table or two tables that are coupled to the apparatus. The system further includes a platform that rotates with an axis of rotation coaxial to the axis of the sector shaped guide for the tables. In addition, the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus is positioned on the platform. As set forth above, *Carrozzi* does not teach or suggest that the magnetic resonance imaging

apparatus is positioned on a rotatable platform. Accordingly, claim 34 is also patentable.

Claims 29, 30, 32, 33, and 35-37 depend from either claim 28 or 34, and are thus also patentable at least for the reasons set forth with respect to the independent claims. In addition, the dependent claims provide additional features which further distinguish over the prior art.

To further define the protection to which Applicants are entitled, new claim 37 has been added which depends from claim, and states that the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus has wheels, rollers, or other means for rotating the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus relative to the patient table. New claim 38 is patentable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections and objections. In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 4, 2007

By:



William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620